

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-22 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner with Claim 2 standing canceled.

The Examiner alleges that the inventors namely Mr. Gibson and Mr. Corso have not signed a Declaration.

Attached to the instant amendment is a copy of a Transmittal Letter which included the executed Declaration.

It is respectfully submitted that all inventors of the instant application have signed Declarations.

The Examiner alleges that Claims 1-22 of this application conflicts with Claims 1-16 of application 10/005,463. Additionally, the Examiner requires the Applicant to either cancel the conflicting claims from one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications.

Claim 2 has been canceled in this application. Other claim amendments will be made in the 10/005,463 application.

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention of Claims 1-16 of 10/005,463.

Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection is premature since there has been no application in fact patented or allowed. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request this rejection to be held in abeyance until one application has in fact been patented.

Turning now to the art rejection, Claims 1-5, 7-9, and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Uscategui; and Claim 6 was rejected under 35

U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Uscategui in view of alleged admitted prior art (AAPA).

These rejections are respectively traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Uscategui does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the pre-driver sub-stage being adapted to accept a current signal (δI_{in}) from the input g_m cell as defined in independent Claim 1.

The Examiner alleges that element g_m is inherent to small signal model of amplifier circuit. Referring to Elements Q1-Q4.

Notwithstanding the allegations of the Examiner, Uscategui discloses Q1-Q4 as input stage 12 and there is not indication that g_m is inherent to these elements.

Furthermore, Uscategui does not disclose or suggest he presently claimed invention including the plurality of transistors configured as translinear loops in independent Claim 9, albeit defined as employing a plurality of non-translinear loops in the pre-driver sub-stage circuits in independent Claims 20 and 22.

Uscategui does not disclose the translinear loops.

Whether or not AAPA discloses a DSL driver and whether or not one of ordinary skill in the art would consider modifying Uscategui is of no moment since the resulting construction would in no way disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention.

No art has been applied to Claims 10-19.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.